

Sean C. Wagner (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Sean.Wagner@wagnerhicks.law
Meagan L. Allen (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Meagan.Allen@wagnerhicks.law
Adam L. Wilson, (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Adam.Wilson@wagnerhicks.law
WAGNER HICKS PLLC
831 East Morehead Street, Suite 860
Charlotte NC 28202
Telephone: (704) 705-7538
Facsimile: (704) 705-7787

John Forest Hilbert, Esq. (SBN 105827)

jhilbert@hscallaw.com

Joseph A. LeVota, Esq. (SBN 226760)

ilavota@hscallaw.com

HILBERT & SATTERLY LLP

409 Camino del Rio S. #104

189 Camino del Rio S. #137
San Diego, California 92108

Telephone: (619) 795-0300

Facsimile: (619) 501-6855

Attorneys for Defendant

Attorneys for Defendants
Goldwater Bank N.A.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MARK AUSSIEKER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**GOLDWATER BANK, N.A., Does 1-10
inclusive**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:22-CV-00851-MCE-DB

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT
GOLDWATER BANK, N.A.'S
RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED
COMPLAINT [ECF No. 36]**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MARK AUSSIEKER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

**GOLDWATER BANK, N.A., Does 1-10
inclusive**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:22-CV-00851-MCE-DB

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT
GOLDWATER BANK, N.A.'S
RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED
COMPLAINT [ECF No. 36]**

The Court having reviewed the submissions of the parties regarding Defendant Goldwater Bank, N.A.’s (“Goldwater”) Renewed Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) (ECF No. 36) finds that Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint (ECF No. 4) fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE and without leave to amend.¹

Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint seeks relief under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), specifically 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) and § 227(b)(1)(B). In his Opposition, Plaintiff admits that his Amended Complaint does not plausibly allege that the single, text message alleged was sent using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) as that term has been interpreted by the Ninth Circuit following the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid*, 141 S. Ct. 1163, 1167 (2021). That is, Plaintiff concedes (and his allegations demonstrate) that Goldwater’s dialing equipment did not generate telephone numbers using a random or sequential number generator, as is required to state a claim under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). See *Borden v. eFinancial, LLC*, 53 F.4th 1230, 1234 (9th

¹ Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice ("RJN") is DENIED. ECF No. 40 (RJN).

1 Cir. 2022); *Trim v. Reward Zone USA LLC*, No. 22-55517, 2023 WL 5043724, at *1
2 (9th Cir. Aug. 8, 2023).

3 Further, Plaintiff's contention that the alleged text message utilized "an
4 artificial or prerecorded voice" under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) or § 227(b)(1)(B) is
5 unsupported by law or any reasonable reading of the TCPA. *See, e.g., Trim v. Reward*
6 *Zone USA LLC*, 76 F.4th 1157 (9th Cir. 2023). As both causes of action alleged in
7 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint are legally insufficient, Plaintiff's Amended
8 Complaint must be dismissed for failure to assert a plausible claim for relief pursuant
9 to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Plaintiff concedes he cannot amend in order to state a
10 valid claim. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 36) is
11 GRANTED without leave to amend. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this
12 case.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: May 13, 2024

15 
16 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
17 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28